



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/734,237	12/15/2003	John Chiang	64965-172	2279
41552	7590	08/06/2007		
MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 4370 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE, SUITE 700 SAN DIEGO, CA 92122			EXAMINER PHAN, MAN U	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

58

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/734,237	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHIANG, JOHN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Man Phan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12-16 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 May 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Amendment and Argument***

1. This communication is in response to applicant's 05/29/2007 Amendment in the application of Chiang for the "Method and apparatus for locking a table in a network switch" filed 12/15/2003 has been examined. This application is a Continuation of the application 09/296,558 filed 04/22/1999 is now abandoned. The amendment and response has been entered and made of record. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application.

Applicant's remark with regard to the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) are persuasive. The Applicant's statement of common ownership, and in support against the cited prior art has been recorded. Furthermore, the subject matter of both Runaldue et al. (US#6,052,751) and the present application was owned by, and/or subject to an obligation of assignment to Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. of Sunnyvale, CA.

2. Applicant's remarks and argument to the rejected claims 10-11 under 35 U.S.C.102(e) are insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior arts or overcome the rejection of said claims as discussed below. Applicant's argument with respect to the pending claims have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for at least the following reasons.

3. In response to Applicant's argument that the reference does not teach or reasonably suggest the functionality upon which the Examiner relies for the rejection. The Examiner first emphasizes for the record that the claims employ a broader in scope than the Applicant's disclosure in all aspects. In addition, the Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of

Art Unit: 2616

the claim limitations, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. Since the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is required to interpret the claim limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP 2111. In other words, the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill-Wilk 1, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims.

Art Unit: 2616

The Examiner has interpreted the claims in parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to distinctly define the claimed invention.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejected claims 10 & 11 (Page 9-10, second paragraphs) that the cited references not identified the use of a scheduler function that allocates times slot for accessing the "*address table*". However, It's the examiner's position that the Runaldue et al. (US#6,052,751) is applied herein merely for the teaching of a method and arrangement for controlling access information stored within a network switch comprising an address table for storing entries that contain addresses of network stations connected to the network switch and a plurality of components capable of accessing the address table (Col. 23, lines 25-31); a Slot manager (scheduler) for allocating prescribed time slots to the plurality of components for accessing the address table (Col. 14, lines 9-16 and Col. 24, lines 51-57). It's noted that the "*address table*" is an example of an address table storage (i.e., memory) for storing address information relating to the ports (addressable memory). Furthermore, Runaldue discloses a multiport switch that receives and transmits data through a plurality of ports, storing data in a memory and controlling access to a memory. A memory interface is often employed to control the access from the sources to the memory. Fig. 14 illustrated a block diagram of a queuing block of the buffer manager of the switch subsystem and a port vector FIFO, in which the port vector FIFO 70 queries the address table 160 with the frame pointer. Upon receiving a frame pointer, the port vector FIFO 70 first queries the address table 160 of the buffer manager 72 to determine the receive port, determines the mode for that receive port, and then monitors the

Art Unit: 2616

flags from that receive port and releases the frame pointer according to the mode and the flags (Col. 22; lines 63 plus).

Since no substantial amendments have been made and the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, the claims are drawn to the same invention and the text of the prior art rejection can be found in the previous Office Action. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the references cited and applied in the last office actions for the rejection of the claims are maintained in this office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

6. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Runaldue et al. (US#6,052,751).

Regarding claim 10, Runaldue et al. disclose a scalable multiport switch that receives and transmits data through a plurality of ports is provided with a plurality of internal buses, an external memory interface, and a slot manager (scheduler). Runaldue teaches an arrangement for controlling access to information stored within a network switch depicted in Fig. 16A comprising: an address table for storing entries that contain addresses of network stations connected to the network switch and a plurality of components capable of accessing the address table (Col. 23, lines 25-31) a scheduler for allocating prescribed time slots to the plurality of

Art Unit: 2616

components for accessing the address table (Col. 14, lines 9-16 and Col. 24, lines 51-57).

Runaldue et al. further teaches wherein each of the components being configured for determining if any other components are currently transacting with the address table during its allocated time slot (Col. 8, lines 6-12, and Col. 22, lines 63-67), and accessing the address table if none of the other components are currently transacting with the address table (Col. 12, lines 24-30, and Col. 14, lines 2-16)

Regarding claim 11, Runaldue et al. further discloses a buffer manager of the switch subsystem and port vector FIFO depicted in Fig. 14 in which when the address table is being accessed, a designated component of the plurality of components is configured to wait until the scheduler allocates another time slot to the designated component in order to determine if any other components are currently transacting with the address table (See Fig. 14; Col. 23, lines 5-8, and lines 18-20)

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 1-9 are allowed as evident by Applicant's amendment.
8. Claims 12-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
9. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

10. **THIS ACTION THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP ' 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3149. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 6:00 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on (571) 27229884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent




Art Unit: 2616

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at toll free 1-866-217-9197.

Mphan

August 03, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Man U. Phan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

**MAN U. PHAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**